# **EXHIBIT 9 FILED UNDER SEAL**

#### Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 2430-17 Filed 12/21/17 Page 2 of 7 ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

```
1
                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2
                 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 3
                      SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
 4
5
                                   )
    WAYMO LLC,
6
               Plaintiff,
7
                                   )Case No.:
               vs.
                                   )3:17-cv-00939-WHA
8
    UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
     OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING )
9
    LLC,
                                   )
10
               Defendants.
11
12
13
                       ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY
14
               VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF DAVID MEALL
15
                    San Francisco, California
16
                     Thursday, April 13, 2017
17
                              Volume 1
18
19
20
21
22
23
    Reported by:
    RACHEL FERRIER, CSR No. 6948
24
    Job No. 2594017
25
    PAGES 1 - 28
                                                Page 1
```

#### Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 2430-17 Filed 12/21/17 Page 3 of 7 ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1	form to ensure they are telling the truth or is it just	03:05:52
2	sometimes?	03:05:56
3	A That I'm not sure.	03:05:56
4	Q Do you know whether Uber, including both the HR	03:05:58
5	department and the legal department, investigates	03:06:07
6	whether an employee is telling the truth when they fill	03:06:08
7	out their HR forms every time?	03:06:12
8	A That I'm not sure.	03:06:14
9	MR. TATE: Asked and answered.	03:06:15
10	BY MS. COOPER:	03:06:16
11	Q In paragraph 5 of your declaration, you describe	03:06:20
12	the template offer letter from Uber that it gives to	03:06:22
13	prospective employees in the Advanced Technologies	03:06:27
14	Group; is that right?	03:06:30
15	A Yes.	03:06:30
16	Q Did Mr. Levandowski sign this offer letter?	03:06:31
17	A I don't have direct knowledge of that.	03:06:37
18	Q Do you have any knowledge of that?	03:06:39
19	A I was not part of the on-boarding or the	03:06:41
20	acquisition itself. That was handled as a special case.	03:06:44
21	Q Who handled the on-boarding of Mr. Levandowski?	03:06:48
22	A I'm not actually sure who was working on it.	03:06:52
23	Q Why do you say it was a special case?	03:06:54
24	A Just, with acquisitions, we don't the	03:06:57
25	recruiting team, which is what I manage, we don't send	03:06:59
		Page 13

# Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 2430-17 Filed 12/21/17 Page 4 of 7 ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1	individual offer letters, so usually that's done as a	03:07:02
2	combination of the corporate and business development	03:07:05
3	team and HR.	03:07:07
4	Q Did you search for Mr. Levandowski's Employment	03:07:08
5	Agreement before this deposition today?	03:07:15
6	A No.	03:07:16
7	Q Have you ever seen Mr. Levandowski's employment	03:07:17
8	agreement before?	03:07:22
9	A No.	03:07:23
10	MS. COOPER: Okay. I'm handing you what I just	03:07:26
11	marked as Exhibit 8. We are going out of order a little	03:07:28
12	bit, but.	03:07:32
13	(Exhibit 8 was marked for identification	03:07:36
14	by the Court Reporter.)	03:07:36
15	BY MS. COOPER:	03:07:36
16	Q Does this look like the template offer letter you	03:07:42
17	described in your declaration?	03:07:45
18	MR. TATE: Objection; vague and ambiguous. The	03:07:52
19	document speaks for itself.	03:07:55
20	MS. COOPER: That's not a proper objection in	03:08:05
21	this court. (I believe objections are limited to form in	03:08:07
22	this district.	03:08:09
23	THE WITNESS: There's no way if I could say if	03:08:25
24	that's the exact exact one. There's a lot of	03:08:27
25	language in here that could have been special terms of	03:08:30
		Page 14

## Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 2430-17 Filed 12/21/17 Page 5 of 7 ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1		THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record, the time	03:18:09
2	is 3:1	8.	03:18:11
3	BY MS.	COOPER:	03:18:12
4	Q	So, Mr. Meall, you said you have never seen an	03:18:15
5	equity	r incentive plan like this, which imposes	03:18:20
6	condit	ions on stock grants, before in your work at Uber;	03:18:23
7	is tha	at correct?	03:18:28
8	A	Yes.	03:18:28
9	Q	Is that because you don't deal with executives'	03:18:29
10	equity	incentive plans?	03:18:34
11	A	I don't deal with equity incentive for	03:18:36
12	execut	ives, no.	03:18:39
13	Q	Do you deal with other employees' equity	03:18:39
14	incent	ive plans?	03:18:43
15	A	Yes.	03:18:44
16	Q	Who deals with executive equity incentive plans?	03:18:44
17	A	It would depend on the situation.	03:18:53
18	Q	Could it fall on your plate if you were hiring an	03:18:55
19	execut	ive during your tenure?	03:19:01
20		MR. TATE: Objection; calls for speculation.	03:19:03
21		THE WITNESS: We have an executive recruiting	03:19:04
22	branch		03:19:08
23	BY MS.	COOPER:	03:19:08
24	Q	If you look at Exhibit 6, the equity incentive	03:19:16
25	plan i	tself, the grant date is not filled out.	03:19:21
			Page 20

## Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 2430-17 Filed 12/21/17 Page 6 of 7 ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1	Google?	03:21:52
2	A No.	03:21:53
3	MR. TATE: Objection; form.	03:21:54
4	BY MS. COOPER:	03:21:56
5	Q Have you ever heard that he didn't steel 14,000	03:21:56
6	files from Google?	03:22:01
7	A No.	03:22:02
8	Q Do you have any basis to doubt that he did steel	03:22:02
9	the 14,000 files?	03:22:06
10	MR. TATE: Objection; form.	03:22:08
11	THE WITNESS: I have no basis to think one way or	03:22:08
12	another.	03:22:12
13	BY MS. COOPER:	03:22:12
14	Q Has Uber investigated whether Mr. Levandowski	03:22:12
15	stole 14,000 files from Waymo?	03:22:15
16	A I have no personal knowledge of an investigation.	03:22:17
17	Q If the HR department had done such an	03:22:20
18	investigation, would you be aware of it?	03:22:25
19	MR. TATE: Objection; calls for speculation.	03:22:27
20	THE WITNESS: No.	03:22:28
21	BY MS. COOPER:	03:22:30
22	Q Why do you say that?	03:22:32
23	A Because that would be privileged information that	03:22:33
24	I wouldn't really need to be privy to.	03:22:37
25	Q Even if it was happening in your own department?	03:22:39
		Page 23

# Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 2430-17 Filed 12/21/17 Page 7 of 7 ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1	A I run recruiting.	03:22:43
2	Q So if the if Uber hasn't investigated whether	03:22:46
3	Waymo's claims are true, can Uber say that	03:22:54
4	Mr. Levandowski didn't steel the 14,000 files from	03:22:56
5	Waymo?	03:22:58
6	MR. TATE: Objection; that misstates the	03:22:59
7	testimony.	03:23:00
8	BY MS. COOPER:	03:23:01
9	Q If you don't know whether Uber has investigated	03:23:02
10	whether Mr. Levandowski stole the files, can Uber say	03:23:05
11	that he didn't?	03:23:09
12	MR. TATE: Objection; calls for speculation.	03:23:09
13	Objection; form.	03:23:14
14	THE WITNESS: They've never said one way or	03:23:14
15	another if they have or have not.	03:23:17
16	BY MS. COOPER:	03:23:20
17	Q In the last paragraph of your deposition of	03:23:26
18	your declaration, paragraph 9 on page 2, you say you	03:23:28
19	have never seen any evidence of any use of Google or	03:23:32
20	Waymo information during your employment at Uber; is	03:23:35
21	that true?	03:23:39
22	A Yes.	03:23:40
23	Q Have you ever heard anybody talk about Google or	03:23:41
24	Waymo information being used at Uber?	03:23:47
25	A No.	03:23:49
		Page 24